

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, dated May 3, 2006, claims 1-43 are pending in the Application, and these same claims have been rejected. The Examiner has substantially incorporated the subject matter from the last Office Action into the present Office Action. Thus, claims 22 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1; claims 1-15, 17-20, 25-33, and 39-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,816 (Broadwin et al.); claims 16, 21, 23, 36, and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Broadwin et al. in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2005/0097619 (Haddad); claims 22, 24, and 38 have been rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Broadwin et al. in view of Haddad and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2004/0083184 (Tsuei); claims 34 and 35 have been rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Broadwin et al. in view U.S. Pat. App. No. 2004/0250282 (Bankers); and claims 42 and 43 have been rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Broadwin et al. in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0124252 (Schaefer).

As a preliminary matter, Applicants have amended some claims, and canceled others. Please see listing of the claims above. Additionally, Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of figures submitted on March 25, 2002.

Rejection of Claims 1-43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

Claims 22 and 24 have been rejected as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, claims 22 and 24 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the enablement rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 27 are the independent claims. For example, claim 1 recites:

A method for generating a datastream at a control location for implementing an interactive television application at a viewer location, comprising:
receiving a first video signal constituting a primary image;
receiving a second video signal constituting a secondary image;
combining the first and second video signals to form a broadcast video signal

representing a composite of the primary and secondary images;
receiving a specification of a predetermined location in at least one of the primary and secondary image as *a specified portion of the composite image*;
generating instructions to form an interactive television client application program which renders *the specified portion of the composite image as a location for a sensitive area*; and
outputting the instructions and the broadcast video signal for transmission to a customer location.

(emphasis added). Specifically, Applicants submit that the cited art, Broadwin et al., does not disclose a “composite image” with a “sensitive area.” *See* paragraph [0028].

In contrast, Broadwin et al. illustrates, in Figs. 17 and 18, an advertising channel selection guide displayed on a user’s television. The selection guide includes a plurality of channels, namely channels 200-207. As shown, each of these channels is reserved advertising channels for advertisers. Each of the corresponding channel names, namely, “Nissan”, “Saturn”, etc., is a hyperlink to one or more corresponding MPEG stills.

With this in mind, the Applicants respectfully submit that a “sensitive area” as a portion of the “composite image” patentably defines over a selection guide with overlaid hyperlinks to a plurality of channels. Broadwin et al. does not disclose a “composite image,” as the Applicants explained in the last response, and it certainly does not disclose a composite image with a “sensitive area” where users may interactively engage the composite image.

The other independent claims, claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 27 also recite similar limitations of “composite image(s)” with “sensitive area(s).” Furthermore, dependent claims 2-10, 13, 20, 22, 24, 28-43, depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims, and thus are considered allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-16, and 18-43 patentably define over the cited art.


DOCKET NO.: IVOO-0006
Application No.: 09/866,765
Office Action Dated: May 3, 2005

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submits that claims 1-16, and 18-43 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: June 30, 2006



Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439